

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/833,667	04/13/2001	Manjari Kuntimaddi	174-885	1721
23517 BINGHAM M	09/833,667 04/13/2001 Manjari Kuntimaddi	EXAMINER		
2020 K Street,		HUNTER, ALVIN A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3711	
			r	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•			
	09/833,667	KUNTIMADDI ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alvin A. Hunter	3711	
The MAILING DATE of this communica riod for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF THIS COMMUNION OF THIS COMMUNION OF THIS COMMUNION OF THIS PROPERTY. THE PROPERTY OF THIS COMMUNION OF THIS	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
atus			
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of the communication (s). 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) 3) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice. 	☐ This action is non-final. allowance except for formal matt	• •	
sposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-4,8-23,39 and 45-51 is/are p 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are p 5) ☐ Claim(s) 4,39 and 45-51 is/are allowed 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3,8-18 and 21-23 is/are reje 7) ☐ Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.		
plication Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a			
Applicant may not request that any objectio	•	` '	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doe 2. Certified copies of the priority doe 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in A he priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
achment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	948) Paper No(s	Summary (PTO-413) S)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application	

09/833,667 Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 39, 45, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimosaka (USPN 5816937) in view of Blahak et al. (USPN 4631319).

Regarding claim 39, Shimosaka discloses a golf ball having a core and a cover and at least a layer between the cover and core wherein a layer covering the core is formed of polyurethane. Shimosaka does not disclose the polyurethane being an IPN. Blahak et al. discloses composition comprising a homopolymer or copolymer including an uretdione group (dimer) wherein the composition can be used to make an interpenetrating polymer network such as those listed in column 10, lines 60 through 68. Shimosaka notes that the material for the layer is not critical although polyurethanes, ionomer, etc are well known ones. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a layer covering the cover made of an IPN having an uretdione group, as taught by Blahak et al., in order to improve strength.

Regarding claims 45 and 46, Shimosaka et al. does not note if the material for the layers are thermoset or thermoplastic. Blahak et al. discloses that the thermoset composition can be combined with thermoplastic compositions in order to form IPNs.

Application/Control Number:

09/833,667 Art Unit: 3711

One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have the layers thermoplastic and/or thermoset so long as the strength is improved.

Claims 1-3, 8-18, and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy, III et al. (USPN 6290614) in view of Frisch et al. (USPN 4742128).

Regarding claims 1, 18, and 22, Kennedy, III et al. discloses a golf ball having a solid core and a cover and at least a layer between the cover and core wherein a layer covering the core is formed of RIM polyurethane. Kennedy, III et al. does not disclose the polyurethane being an IPN. Frisch et al. discloses an interpenetrating polymer network formed of RIM polyurethane. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have a layer covering the cover made of a polyurethane IPN, as taught by Frisch et al., in order to improve strength. Further, it is submitted that that shear category is at least one less than that of which is free of an IPN being that the composition has improved strength.

Regarding claim 2, Kennedy, III et al. notes that the core, intermediate layer, or cover can be made of a RIM polyurethane. In combination with Frisch et al., one having ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to have any of these layers to be made of a IPN in order to improve strength.

Regarding claim 3, Kennedy, III et al. discloses the cover having a hardness greater than 15 Shore A and the golf ball having a COR greater than 0.7 See (examples).

Art Unit: 3711

Regarding claim 8, see the above regarding claim 1. Further, Frisch et al. notes that the RIM polyurethane composition may be a semi-IPN.

Regarding claim 9, Kennedy, III et al. notes that the core, intermediate layer, or cover can be made of a RIM polyurethane. In combination with Frisch et al., one having ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to have any of these layers to be made of a semi-IPN in order to improve strength.

Regarding claims 10-17, see the above regarding claim 1. Further, the additional limitations regarding the glass transition temperature, phase size, and melting exotherm are presumed to naturally flow from the prior art being that the office does not have the ability to compare these limitations through testing.

Regarding claim 21, Kennedy, III et al. discloses the cover having an inner and outer cover (See Figure 3).

Regarding claim 22 and 23, see the above regarding claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 39, and 45-51 are allowed.

Claims 19 and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/06/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Fritsch require the mold to be heated higher than

09/833,667

Art Unit: 3711

Kennedy, III et al. It is notes the Kennedy, III et al. uses 100 to 180F as an example and thus is not limiting. For this reason the above rejection has been furnished.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alvin A. Hunter whose telephone number is 571-272-4411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30AM to 4:00PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene Kim, can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alvin A. Hunter, Jr.